# Handguns Generic Case Answers

## Top Level

### 1NC – Generic

#### Turn – violent conflicts will occur regardless but owning a gun reduces the likelihood of serious injury or death

Lott 13

[John R. Lott - economist, political commentator, and gun rights advocate, formerly employed at University of Chicago, Yale University, the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Maryland: “More Guns, Less Crime: Understanding Crime and Gun Control Laws, Third Edition” University of Chicago Press, Jan 29, 2013]IG 12/14/15

Yet the evidence suggests that the College Park woman probably en- gaged in the correct action. While resistance is generally associated with higher probabilities of serious injury to the victim, not all types of resistance are equally risky. By examining the data provided from I979 to 1987 by the Department of justice’s National Crime Victimization Survey." Law- rence Southwick, confirming earlier estimates by Gary Kleck, found that the probability of serious injury from an attack is 2.5 times greater for women offering no resistance than for women resisting with a gun. In contrast, the probability of women being seriously injured was almost 4 times greater when resisting without a gun than when resisting with a gun. In other words. the best advice is to resist with a gun. but if no gun is available, it is better to offer no resistance than to fight."

#### Turn - Increased private gun ownership deters would-be criminals, reducing violent crime

Huemer 3 Michael Huemer (professor of philosophy at UC Boulder). “Is There a Right to Own a Gun?” Social Theory and Practice, vol. 29, no. 2. April 2003. http://www.owl232.net/guncontrol.htm [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

Gun control proponents may find these statistics theoretically surprising: increasing the availability of one important means of committing violent crimes, they believe, should increase the violent crime rate.Footnote But an alternative theory gives the opposite prediction: Increased availability of guns to citizens, including the ability to carry concealed weapons, increases the risks to would-be criminals of experiencing undesired consequences as a result of attempting a violent crime. These consequences include being shot, being detained by the would-be victim until the police arrive, and simply being unable to complete the crime. Thus, other [316] things being equal, increased availability of guns to the general public should result in decreased violent crime. Lott’s study strongly corroborates this theory. But even before considering statistical evidence, the theory is more plausible than that offered by gun control supporters. Gun control laws tend to influence the behavior of would-be crime victims much more than the behavior of criminals. Those who are willing to commit violent felonies are much more likely than the average citizen to be willing to commit misdemeanors such as carrying a concealed weapon without a permit. They are also more likely to have black market contacts capable of supplying them with illegal weapons. Thus, laws that prohibit or place obstacles in the way of carrying concealed weapons, or owning weapons at all, are likely to cause a much greater reduction in the proportion of armed victims than in the proportion of armed criminals. Furthermore, one can guess that the possibility of encountering an armed victim probably has a greater effect on would-be criminals, with respect to deterring violent crimes, than would a moderate increase in the difficulty of obtaining a gun to assist in crimes, since the feared consequences of attacking an armed victim are extremely serious, whereas increased difficulty in obtaining a gun is a relatively small impediment to committing a violent crime, particularly if one can choose a victim who is physically weaker than oneself and unarmed, or if one has black market contacts. This argument is inconclusive, since it could be that very few noncriminals would carry guns for self-protection even if allowed to, in which case the risk to criminals of encountering armed victims would still be a minor factor. But in fact, a great many non-criminal Americans presently own guns, and approximately 9% of Americans surveyed admit to carrying a gun for self-protection outside the home.Footnote Accordingly, criminals surveyed report being more afraid of encountering armed victims than they are of encountering the police.Footnote For these reasons, one should not be surprised that the effect of stricter gun laws of reducing a deterrent to violent crime should [317] predominate over their effect of making it harder to obtain tools for assisting in such crimes.

#### Handgun ban forces criminals to switch to deadlier weapons—substantially increases murder rates.

Kopel 93 [David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm] JW

If handguns were somehow removed from the hands of malfeasants, would the death toll actually increase? Some gun misusers would switch to knives (not much less deadly than small handguns), while others would switch to rifles and shotguns (much more likely to kill than handguns). If enough misusers switched from handguns to long guns, the death toll might therefore increase, or so the "substitution argument" goes. Dixon confronts the substitution argument carefully, and provides one of the most comprehensive critiques of substitution theory ever offered by a handgun prohibitionist. \*327 Dixon is right to take the substitution argument seriously. While handgun wounds are usually survivable, especially if the victim gets medical attention quickly, shotgun blasts at close range are much more likely to be fatal. The shotgun fires a large slug, or from six to more than sixty pellets, with one trigger squeeze. A single shotgun pellet, because it may be of a diameter equal to a small handgun bullet, can inflict nearly as much damage as a small handgun bullet. [[177](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#177)] Wound ballistics and firearms experts concur that at short range, a shotgun is by far the deadliest weapon. [[178](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#178)] Anti-prohibition writers such as David Hardy, Gary Kleck, and Don Kates have argued that a high level of substitution of long guns for handguns would occur in the case of a hypothetical American handgun ban. Dixon offers a careful rebuttal of their arguments, and concludes that (since he has placed the burden of proof on prohibition opponents) the case for a substitution effect has not been proven convincingly enough to overcome what he considers the strong evidence for handgun prohibition. Overlooked in the discussion of a substitution effect resulting from a hypothetical American handgun ban is non- hypothetical evidence from other countries. As Dixon showed earlier in his article, countries with more handguns per capita tend to have more handgun homicides per capita. [[179](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#179)] Switzerland, which has, by world standards, relatively lenient handgun laws, has more handgun homicides per capita than countries where handgun laws are tougher. [[180](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#180)] From the handgun density/handgun homicide correlation in Switzerland and other nations (as well as from other evidence detailed supra), Dixon concludes that handgun density strictly correlates with handgun homicide. [[181](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#181)] Let us \*328 assume that Dixon is right. In countries such as Australia and Canada, where handgun laws are much stricter than in Switzerland, the handgun homicide rate is lower than in Switzerland, but the total homicide rate is over 100 percent greater. [[182](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#182)] The reason cannot be that Australians and Canadians are more prone to want to kill somebody than the Swiss are - Dixon has explicitly assumed that human nature in developed countries is roughly similar everywhere. [[183](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#183)] So why then do Canada and Australia have more murders, even though they have stricter handgun laws, and fewer handgun murders? One plausible explanation is the substitution effect. A sufficiently large number of Australians and Canadians, unable to obtain handguns, do their shooting with rifles or shotguns; their victims die, whereas if they had been shot with handguns, many would have survived. Although some Australian and Canadian assailants, unable to obtain handguns, switched to less deadly weapons (such as clubs), the number of assailants who switched to rifles and shotguns was sufficiently large to increase the overall death toll. If we have plausible evidence to suggest that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur in the United States? [[184](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#184)] \*329 Dixon quotes research developed by Don Kates and Mark Benenson that if 30% of persons attempting homicide switched from handguns to long guns, while the other 70% switched to knives, total homicide would increase substantially. If 50% switched to long guns, the homicide rate could double, even if none of the persons switching to knives killed anyone. [[185](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#185)] A National Institute of Justice study of felons in state prisons found that 72% of the handgun criminals said they would switch to sawed-off shotguns if handguns became unavailable. [[186](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#186)] A 72% substitution rate would lead to an enormous multiplication of the current homicide rate, and Kleck expects that substitution would occur at about 70%. Dixon retorts that criminals are apt to be braggarts and liars, and might claim that nothing, including a handgun ban, could stop them from committing any crime they chose. Accordingly, the 72% substitution figure might be too high. True enough. But at the same time, at least some criminals may be highly suspicious and mistrustful of authority. Although the National Institute of Justice polling, conducted through written response to written questions, offered the respondents anonymity, some of the prisoners might have believed that their responses would not in fact be anonymous; the polling might be a "setup" to discern their plans after release, and provide a reason for denying parole. Thus, some handgun criminals might have falsely said that they would not substitute sawed-off shotguns for unavailable handguns. Do the number of braggart criminals who falsely said that they would use sawed-off shotguns outnumber the number of mistrustful criminals who falsely said they would not? It is difficult to say with certainty. But since 72% of the criminals said they would substitute, and since only 30% substitution is needed to increase substantially the homicide rate, there is a wide margin for error to assume that bragging criminals outnumber suspicious ones. Dixon critiques the Benenson and Kates estimate of a homicide rate increase because Benenson and Kates assumed that handgun users who did not switch to long guns would switch "downward" to the next most deadly weapon, knives. Almost certainly, some handgun users would, rather than using knives, turn to even less deadly weapons, such as fists, or would not attempt murder in the first place, absent a handgun. [[187](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#187)] But when calculating expected deaths resulting from substitution, Kates and Benenson assumed that none of the persons who switched to knives would kill anyone; in terms of resulting deaths, therefore, Kates and Benenson underestimated the \*330 deaths that would be caused by murderers who switched downward to less lethal weapons. Even assuming that none of the persons who switched down killed anyone, the homicide rate would double if half of the handgun-deprived criminals switched "up" to long guns. [[188](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#188)] Another tack taken by Dixon is to argue that high rates of substitution are unlikely because long guns are so inferior for most criminal purposes. He notes first of all that less than 10% of murders are currently perpetrated with long guns. [[189](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#189)] This is true, but, as Dixon strenuously argues, handguns are widely preferred as murder weapons, and widely available. Thus, it should not be surprising that more than 6 out of 7 gun murderers chose the "best" tool, a handgun. But what people choose when the "best" option is available does not prove how they would behave if only inferior options were available. Today, virtually all hard liquor drinkers consume the "best" hard liquor available - namely legally-produced hard liquor whose production is regulated by the government to guarantee standards of safety. Probably less than 5% of American hard liquor consumers drink bathtub gin, moonshine, and other home- brewed liquors whose safety cannot be guaranteed. Does the fact prove that very few liquor drinkers would, if legal liquor became unavailable, substitute home-brewed liquor? To the contrary, the experience of alcohol prohibition showed that a large percentage of liquor consumers, if unable to obtain safe, legal liquor, will switch to inferior, dangerous homemade liquor. [[190](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#190)] That murderers only rarely use long guns today does not prove that murders would eschew long guns if handguns were unavailable, any more than drinkers of legal liquor would eschew bathtub gin. [[191](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#191)] As another argument against substitution, Dixon points out that long guns are less concealable than handguns. Even when sawed off, a shotgun is still about 11 inches long, making it slightly larger than big handguns, and much larger than the small, low-caliber handguns which are frequently used in crime. Would sawed-off shotguns frequently be substituted in a \*331 robberies? Putting an 11 inch shotgun in one's front pocket would not be very effective concealment. On the other hand, sticking the shotgun in the inner pocket of a large coat or jacket would seem reasonably effective.

#### Prefer –

#### It conducted field interviews with criminals, which is the best data on this question since it asks the people who best understand and participate in the situation

#### It draws on international data to prove that gun bans increase use of more dangerous weaponry – prefer direct statistical evidence to analytical reasoning since it more closely reflects what actually happens

#### Plan doesn’t solve – the most deadly guns can be made at home legally for 10 times less and can be made completely untraceable

Kerr 14

[Dara Kerr - staff reporter for CNET covering the on-demand economy and tech culture: "'Ghost Gunner' lets people make untraceable, homemade guns" CNET 10/1/14; http://www.cnet.com/news/ghost-gunner-lets-people-make-untraceable-home-made-guns/]IG 12/10/15

What is a "ghost gun?" It's any type of firearm that is self-assembled and untraceable. It's one of gun control advocates and lawmakers biggest fears.

A few years ago, putting together such guns took insider knowledge and expertise. But with the growth of 3D printing, making gun parts has become easier. Now, with the release of a low-cost home milling machine, anonymously making firearm parts is even simpler.

Cody Wilson, the self-described anarchist who debuted the first 3D printed handgun in 2013, announced the launch of his newest project on Wednesday called Ghost Gunner.

Ghost Gunner is a computer-connected milling machine that aims to streamline the making of metal lower receivers for AR-15 semi-automatic rifles. While putting together AR-15 lower receivers at home is nothing new, Wilson's machine could speed up and modernize the process.

So, why the lower receiver? Under US firearms laws, it's the one piece of the gun that's legally considered a firearm and carries the gun's serial number. Therefore, an AR-15 with a handmade lower receiver is completely untraceable.

The AR-15 is thought of as one of the most deadly guns in the US. Several mass shootings over the past couple of years involved an AR-15, from Aurora to Newton to Santa Monica.

To name his milling machine, Wilson borrowed the term "ghost gun" from gun control advocates. In fact, a large part of his project is to thumb his nose at lawmakers trying to outlaw the making of untraceable guns at home.

California state Sen. Kevin de Leon has been working to pass a law that would require self-made guns to contain permanent pieces of metal and be registered with the Department of Justice through a serial number and gun owner background check.

"Technological advancements require that we update our laws to meet new and growing public safety concerns to make sure dangerous individuals cannot manipulate technologies at the expense of public safety," de Leon said in August as his bill headed to the governor's desk.

Wilson, and his organization Defense Distributed, took de Leon's bill proposal as a call to arms.

"It just seemed to be such an affront and also a challenge," Wilson told CNET. "We used his creation and his words to trademark the project...The ball is in his court."

California Gov. Jerry Brown vetoed de Leon's bill on Tuesday (PDF) saying, "I appreciated the author's concerns about gun violence, but I can't see how adding a serial number to a homemade gun would significantly advance public safety."

Defense Distributed built Ghost Gunner from the ground up using open-source hardware. The compact cube-shaped mill is constructed with a rigid steel frame and its drill bit can ready a lower receiver to be fit into other AR-15 components in an hour.

The Ghost Gunner costs around $1,500. Wilson said the machine can reliably drill one lower receiver per hour at the production output of a machine 10 times its cost.

When asked whether he's nervous about the authorities cracking down on him, Wilson said he's tried to cover his bases.

"It's going to be news to me with whatever they come up with," Wilson said. "We tried to satisfy every letter of every law."

#### Federal agencies that would regulate gun control are severely understaffed – means no aff solvency

Harwood 02

[Harwood, William S - attorney in Portland, Maine, President of Maine Citizens Against Handgun Violence and a member of the American Bar Association Coordinating Committee on Gun Violence: "Gun Control: State Versus Federal Regulation of Firearms." Maine Policy Review 11.1 (2002) : 58 -73, [http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mpr/vol11/iss1/12.]IG](http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mpr/vol11/iss1/12.%5dIG) 12/2/15

Another potential factor in deciding whether the state or federal government should regulate firearms is which level of government is in the best position to effectively enforce those regulations. Although there is increasing cooperation between state and federal law enforcement, the general rule remains that federal law enforcement agencies enforce federal law, and state and local law enforcement agencies enforce state and local law. Therefore, the level of government that sets the regulations will normally be responsible for enforcing it. Clearly, strict enforcement of firearm regulations is important to successfully reducing gun violence. Indeed, in recent years the NRA has argued against more regulation of firearms by claiming that first the government needs to do a better job of enforcing the existing laws.

The federal agency with primary responsibility for firearm regulation is the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF). Despite having been in existence for many years, ATF’s powers are mostly limited to the licensing and taxation of firearm dealers. Because of its limited jurisdiction, ATF has a relatively small workforce; less than ten agents are assigned to the state of Maine. With this limited workforce, it is hard to imagine how ATF can effectively regulate the 1.3 million firearms in a state covering an area larger than the other five New England states combined. Although the federal government could expand the ATF workforce and investigatory powers, ATF does not currently have the resources to take on the primary responsibility for regulation of firearms.

#### Courts will strike down total bans, but regulations are upheld

Volokh 10 [Eugene Volokh (professor of law at the University of California, Los Angeles), "An End to Gun Bans," NY Times, 3/2/2010] AZ

Of the 50 states, 44 have state constitutional provisions that expressly secure a [right to keep and bear arms](http://www.trolp.org/main_pgs/issues/v11n1/Volokh.pdf) . At least 40 of them clearly protect an individual right, aimed partly at self-defense. But less stringent gun control laws may survive. Yet state courts interpreting those provisions have upheld the great majority of all modest gun controls that they have considered. They have struck down some total gun bans, and some other restrictions that dramatically affect people’s abilities to defend themselves. But less stringent restrictions have almost always been upheld. Likewise, federal courts applying D.C. v. Heller have upheld the great majority of the restrictions that they have considered, including all of the less stringent ones. Thus, for instance, courts have upheld bans on particular kinds of semi-automatic firearms (so-called “assault weapons”) precisely because the bans left people free to own many different kinds of other handguns, rifles, and shotguns that were just as effective for self-defense. The same seems likely to happen with federal review of state and local gun bans, if the U.S. Supreme Court concludes that the Second Amendment — like the First Amendment, the Fourth Amendment, and most of the rest of the Bill of Rights — applies to the states via the Fourteenth Amendment. Total handgun bans would be struck down. The same might happen to some of the most restrictive gun controls, such as laws banning gun possession by non-citizens (even ones who legally live in the U.S.). But less stringent gun controls, whether or not wise as a matter of policy, are almost certain to be upheld.

### Substitution Effect

#### Handgun ban forces criminals to switch to deadlier weapons—substantially increases murder rates.

Kopel 93 [David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm] JW

If handguns were somehow removed from the hands of malfeasants, would the death toll actually increase? Some gun misusers would switch to knives (not much less deadly than small handguns), while others would switch to rifles and shotguns (much more likely to kill than handguns). If enough misusers switched from handguns to long guns, the death toll might therefore increase, or so the "substitution argument" goes. Dixon confronts the substitution argument carefully, and provides one of the most comprehensive critiques of substitution theory ever offered by a handgun prohibitionist. \*327 Dixon is right to take the substitution argument seriously. While handgun wounds are usually survivable, especially if the victim gets medical attention quickly, shotgun blasts at close range are much more likely to be fatal. The shotgun fires a large slug, or from six to more than sixty pellets, with one trigger squeeze. A single shotgun pellet, because it may be of a diameter equal to a small handgun bullet, can inflict nearly as much damage as a small handgun bullet. [[177](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#177)] Wound ballistics and firearms experts concur that at short range, a shotgun is by far the deadliest weapon. [[178](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#178)] Anti-prohibition writers such as David Hardy, Gary Kleck, and Don Kates have argued that a high level of substitution of long guns for handguns would occur in the case of a hypothetical American handgun ban. Dixon offers a careful rebuttal of their arguments, and concludes that (since he has placed the burden of proof on prohibition opponents) the case for a substitution effect has not been proven convincingly enough to overcome what he considers the strong evidence for handgun prohibition. Overlooked in the discussion of a substitution effect resulting from a hypothetical American handgun ban is non- hypothetical evidence from other countries. As Dixon showed earlier in his article, countries with more handguns per capita tend to have more handgun homicides per capita. [[179](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#179)] Switzerland, which has, by world standards, relatively lenient handgun laws, has more handgun homicides per capita than countries where handgun laws are tougher. [[180](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#180)] From the handgun density/handgun homicide correlation in Switzerland and other nations (as well as from other evidence detailed supra), Dixon concludes that handgun density strictly correlates with handgun homicide. [[181](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#181)] Let us \*328 assume that Dixon is right. In countries such as Australia and Canada, where handgun laws are much stricter than in Switzerland, the handgun homicide rate is lower than in Switzerland, but the total homicide rate is over 100 percent greater. [[182](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#182)] The reason cannot be that Australians and Canadians are more prone to want to kill somebody than the Swiss are - Dixon has explicitly assumed that human nature in developed countries is roughly similar everywhere. [[183](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#183)] So why then do Canada and Australia have more murders, even though they have stricter handgun laws, and fewer handgun murders? One plausible explanation is the substitution effect. A sufficiently large number of Australians and Canadians, unable to obtain handguns, do their shooting with rifles or shotguns; their victims die, whereas if they had been shot with handguns, many would have survived. Although some Australian and Canadian assailants, unable to obtain handguns, switched to less deadly weapons (such as clubs), the number of assailants who switched to rifles and shotguns was sufficiently large to increase the overall death toll. If we have plausible evidence to suggest that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur in the United States? [[184](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#184)] \*329 Dixon quotes research developed by Don Kates and Mark Benenson that if 30% of persons attempting homicide switched from handguns to long guns, while the other 70% switched to knives, total homicide would increase substantially. If 50% switched to long guns, the homicide rate could double, even if none of the persons switching to knives killed anyone. [[185](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#185)] A National Institute of Justice study of felons in state prisons found that 72% of the handgun criminals said they would switch to sawed-off shotguns if handguns became unavailable. [[186](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#186)] A 72% substitution rate would lead to an enormous multiplication of the current homicide rate, and Kleck expects that substitution would occur at about 70%. Dixon retorts that criminals are apt to be braggarts and liars, and might claim that nothing, including a handgun ban, could stop them from committing any crime they chose. Accordingly, the 72% substitution figure might be too high. True enough. But at the same time, at least some criminals may be highly suspicious and mistrustful of authority. Although the National Institute of Justice polling, conducted through written response to written questions, offered the respondents anonymity, some of the prisoners might have believed that their responses would not in fact be anonymous; the polling might be a "setup" to discern their plans after release, and provide a reason for denying parole. Thus, some handgun criminals might have falsely said that they would not substitute sawed-off shotguns for unavailable handguns. Do the number of braggart criminals who falsely said that they would use sawed-off shotguns outnumber the number of mistrustful criminals who falsely said they would not? It is difficult to say with certainty. But since 72% of the criminals said they would substitute, and since only 30% substitution is needed to increase substantially the homicide rate, there is a wide margin for error to assume that bragging criminals outnumber suspicious ones. Dixon critiques the Benenson and Kates estimate of a homicide rate increase because Benenson and Kates assumed that handgun users who did not switch to long guns would switch "downward" to the next most deadly weapon, knives. Almost certainly, some handgun users would, rather than using knives, turn to even less deadly weapons, such as fists, or would not attempt murder in the first place, absent a handgun. [[187](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#187)] But when calculating expected deaths resulting from substitution, Kates and Benenson assumed that none of the persons who switched to knives would kill anyone; in terms of resulting deaths, therefore, Kates and Benenson underestimated the \*330 deaths that would be caused by murderers who switched downward to less lethal weapons. Even assuming that none of the persons who switched down killed anyone, the homicide rate would double if half of the handgun-deprived criminals switched "up" to long guns. [[188](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#188)] Another tack taken by Dixon is to argue that high rates of substitution are unlikely because long guns are so inferior for most criminal purposes. He notes first of all that less than 10% of murders are currently perpetrated with long guns. [[189](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#189)] This is true, but, as Dixon strenuously argues, handguns are widely preferred as murder weapons, and widely available. Thus, it should not be surprising that more than 6 out of 7 gun murderers chose the "best" tool, a handgun. But what people choose when the "best" option is available does not prove how they would behave if only inferior options were available. Today, virtually all hard liquor drinkers consume the "best" hard liquor available - namely legally-produced hard liquor whose production is regulated by the government to guarantee standards of safety. Probably less than 5% of American hard liquor consumers drink bathtub gin, moonshine, and other home- brewed liquors whose safety cannot be guaranteed. Does the fact prove that very few liquor drinkers would, if legal liquor became unavailable, substitute home-brewed liquor? To the contrary, the experience of alcohol prohibition showed that a large percentage of liquor consumers, if unable to obtain safe, legal liquor, will switch to inferior, dangerous homemade liquor. [[190](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#190)] That murderers only rarely use long guns today does not prove that murders would eschew long guns if handguns were unavailable, any more than drinkers of legal liquor would eschew bathtub gin. [[191](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#191)] As another argument against substitution, Dixon points out that long guns are less concealable than handguns. Even when sawed off, a shotgun is still about 11 inches long, making it slightly larger than big handguns, and much larger than the small, low-caliber handguns which are frequently used in crime. Would sawed-off shotguns frequently be substituted in a \*331 robberies? Putting an 11 inch shotgun in one's front pocket would not be very effective concealment. On the other hand, sticking the shotgun in the inner pocket of a large coat or jacket would seem reasonably effective.

#### Prefer –

#### It conducted field interviews with criminals, which is the best data on this question since it asks the people who best understand and participate in the situation

#### It draws on international data to prove that gun bans increase use of more dangerous weaponry – prefer direct statistical evidence to analytical reasoning since it more closely reflects what actually happens

### Self Defense

#### Turn – violent conflicts will occur regardless but owning a gun reduces the likelihood of serious injury or death

Lott 13

[John R. Lott - economist, political commentator, and gun rights advocate, formerly employed at University of Chicago, Yale University, the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Maryland: “More Guns, Less Crime: Understanding Crime and Gun Control Laws, Third Edition” University of Chicago Press, Jan 29, 2013]IG 12/14/15

Yet the evidence suggests that the College Park woman probably en- gaged in the correct action. While resistance is generally associated with higher probabilities of serious injury to the victim, not all types of resistance are equally risky. By examining the data provided from I979 to 1987 by the Department of justice’s National Crime Victimization Survey." Law- rence Southwick, confirming earlier estimates by Gary Kleck, found that the probability of serious injury from an attack is 2.5 times greater for women offering no resistance than for women resisting with a gun. In contrast, the probability of women being seriously injured was almost 4 times greater when resisting without a gun than when resisting with a gun. In other words. the best advice is to resist with a gun. but if no gun is available, it is better to offer no resistance than to fight."

#### National surveys confirm—Americans frequently use guns for self-defense

Huemer 3 Michael Huemer (professor of philosophy at UC Boulder). “Is There a Right to Own a Gun?” Social Theory and Practice, vol. 29, no. 2. April 2003. http://www.owl232.net/guncontrol.htm [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

5.2.1. Frequency of Defensive Gun Uses Guns are used surprisingly often by private citizens in the United States for self-defense purposes. Fifteen surveys, excluding the one discussed in the following paragraph, have been conducted since 1976, yielding estimates of between 760,000 and 3.6 million defensive gun uses per year, the average estimate being 1.8 million. Probably among the more reliable is Kleck and Gertz’ 1993 national survey, which obtained an estimate of 2.5 million annual defensive gun uses, excluding military and police uses and excluding uses against animals. Gun users in 400,000 of these cases believe that the [313] gun certainly or almost certainly saved a life.Footnote While survey respondents almost certainly overestimated their danger, if even one tenth of them were correct, the number of lives saved by guns each year would exceed the number of gun homicides and suicides. For the purposes of Kleck and Gertz’ study, a “defensive gun use” requires respondents to have actually seen a person (as opposed, for example, to merely hearing a suspicious noise in the yard) whom they believed was committing or attempting to commit a crime against them, and to have at a minimum threatened the person with a gun, but not necessarily to have fired the gun. Kleck’s statistics imply that defensive gun uses outnumber crimes committed with guns by a ratio of about 3:1. While Kleck’s statistics could be an overestimate, one should bear three points in mind before relying on such a hypothesis to discount the defensive value of guns. First, Kleck’s figures would have to be very large overestimates in order for the harms of guns to exceed their benefits. Second, one would have to suppose that all fifteen of the surveys alluded to have contained overestimates. Third, it is not clear prima facie that an overestimate is more likely than an underestimate; perhaps some respondents either invent or misdescribe incidents, but perhaps also some respondents either forget or prefer not to discuss their defensive gun uses with a stranger on the telephone.

#### Empirics prove—guns are a very effective means of self-defense

Hsiao 15 Timothy Hsiao (professor of philosophy at Florida State University). “Against Gun Bans and Restrictive Licensing.” Essays in Philosophy, Vol. 16, No. 2. July 7th, 2015. http://commons.pacificu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1531&context=eip [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

It is a fact that guns provide considerable defensive benefits. Simple armchair reflection reveals that guns are especially suited toward this end. Guns are commonly touted as equalizers that control for physical disparities that are often exploited in violent crimes. It is no wonder that the empirical evidence indicates that guns are frequently used for self-defense. According to a 2013 report by the Institute of Medicine and National Research Council, “[a]lmost all national survey estimates indicate that defensive gun uses by victims are at least as common as offensive uses by criminals, with estimates of annual uses ranging from about 500,000 to more than 3 million per year, in the context of about 300,000 violent crimes involving firearms in 2008.”iv Perhaps the most famous of these surveys, conducted by Kleck and Gertz (1995), found that guns were used defensively more around 2.5 million times each year in the United States. Even if this number is exaggerated, as critics sometimes allege, it is no exaggeration that there are a large number of defensive gun uses, and that this number is non-trivial. In addition to the frequency of defensive uses, numerous studies have found that resisting violent crime with a gun is correlated with lower injury rates.vi Indeed, it has been consistently found that forceful resistance with a gun is more effective at fending off violent attack than both resistance with other forceful means and non-resistance. Kleck and Delone (1993) assessed eight different forms of robbery resistance and found that “victim gun use was the resistance strategy most strongly and consistently associated with successful outcomes for robbery victims.” Southwick (2000) found that women who resisted an attack without a gun were four times more likely to be seriously injured than women who resisted with a gun. Men who resisted with a gun were also less likely to be seriously injured than men who either did not resist at all or who resisted without a gun.vii Kleck and Tark (2004: 861) assessed sixteen different forms of victim self-protection and found that “a variety of mostly forceful tactics, including resistance with a gun, appeared to have the strongest effects in reducing the risk of injury.” Guerette and Santana (2010) found that the odds of robbery and rape completion were decreased by 93 and 92 percent when a victim resisted with a gun. It should also be noted that in the vast majority of cases where guns were used defensively, the gun was not fired. According to Kleck (1999: 297), “there are about 7,700 to 18,500 reported legal shootings of criminals a year, which would be less than 1% of all defensive gun uses. The rest of defensive gun uses, then, involve neither killings nor woundings but rather misses, warning shots fired, or guns used to threaten, by pointing them or verbally referring to them.” Lott (2010) found that in most cases, simply brandishing a gun was sufficient to repel an attack.

### Deterrence

#### Increased private gun ownership deters would-be criminals, reducing violent crime

Huemer 3 Michael Huemer (professor of philosophy at UC Boulder). “Is There a Right to Own a Gun?” Social Theory and Practice, vol. 29, no. 2. April 2003. http://www.owl232.net/guncontrol.htm [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

Gun control proponents may find these statistics theoretically surprising: increasing the availability of one important means of committing violent crimes, they believe, should increase the violent crime rate.Footnote But an alternative theory gives the opposite prediction: Increased availability of guns to citizens, including the ability to carry concealed weapons, increases the risks to would-be criminals of experiencing undesired consequences as a result of attempting a violent crime. These consequences include being shot, being detained by the would-be victim until the police arrive, and simply being unable to complete the crime. Thus, other [316] things being equal, increased availability of guns to the general public should result in decreased violent crime. Lott’s study strongly corroborates this theory. But even before considering statistical evidence, the theory is more plausible than that offered by gun control supporters. Gun control laws tend to influence the behavior of would-be crime victims much more than the behavior of criminals. Those who are willing to commit violent felonies are much more likely than the average citizen to be willing to commit misdemeanors such as carrying a concealed weapon without a permit. They are also more likely to have black market contacts capable of supplying them with illegal weapons. Thus, laws that prohibit or place obstacles in the way of carrying concealed weapons, or owning weapons at all, are likely to cause a much greater reduction in the proportion of armed victims than in the proportion of armed criminals. Furthermore, one can guess that the possibility of encountering an armed victim probably has a greater effect on would-be criminals, with respect to deterring violent crimes, than would a moderate increase in the difficulty of obtaining a gun to assist in crimes, since the feared consequences of attacking an armed victim are extremely serious, whereas increased difficulty in obtaining a gun is a relatively small impediment to committing a violent crime, particularly if one can choose a victim who is physically weaker than oneself and unarmed, or if one has black market contacts. This argument is inconclusive, since it could be that very few noncriminals would carry guns for self-protection even if allowed to, in which case the risk to criminals of encountering armed victims would still be a minor factor. But in fact, a great many non-criminal Americans presently own guns, and approximately 9% of Americans surveyed admit to carrying a gun for self-protection outside the home.Footnote Accordingly, criminals surveyed report being more afraid of encountering armed victims than they are of encountering the police.Footnote For these reasons, one should not be surprised that the effect of stricter gun laws of reducing a deterrent to violent crime should [317] predominate over their effect of making it harder to obtain tools for assisting in such crimes.

### Rollback

#### Courts will strike down total bans, but regulations are upheld

Volokh 10 [Eugene Volokh (professor of law at the University of California, Los Angeles), "An End to Gun Bans," NY Times, 3/2/2010] AZ

Of the 50 states, 44 have state constitutional provisions that expressly secure a [right to keep and bear arms](http://www.trolp.org/main_pgs/issues/v11n1/Volokh.pdf) . At least 40 of them clearly protect an individual right, aimed partly at self-defense. But less stringent gun control laws may survive. Yet state courts interpreting those provisions have upheld the great majority of all modest gun controls that they have considered. They have struck down some total gun bans, and some other restrictions that dramatically affect people’s abilities to defend themselves. But less stringent restrictions have almost always been upheld. Likewise, federal courts applying D.C. v. Heller have upheld the great majority of the restrictions that they have considered, including all of the less stringent ones. Thus, for instance, courts have upheld bans on particular kinds of semi-automatic firearms (so-called “assault weapons”) precisely because the bans left people free to own many different kinds of other handguns, rifles, and shotguns that were just as effective for self-defense. The same seems likely to happen with federal review of state and local gun bans, if the U.S. Supreme Court concludes that the Second Amendment — like the First Amendment, the Fourth Amendment, and most of the rest of the Bill of Rights — applies to the states via the Fourteenth Amendment. Total handgun bans would be struck down. The same might happen to some of the most restrictive gun controls, such as laws banning gun possession by non-citizens (even ones who legally live in the U.S.). But less stringent gun controls, whether or not wise as a matter of policy, are almost certain to be upheld.

### A2 Dixon 93 [Substitution]

#### Kopel explicitly accounts for Dixon's study and concludes that empirical data more strongly supports our argument

### A2 Suicide Adv

#### **Gun rights actually decrease suicide**

ILA 15 ["Gun Control Not Associated With Reducing Suicides," FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2015 Institute for Legislative Action <https://www.nraila.org/articles/20150918/gun-control-not-associated-with-reducing-suicides>]

Dealing with the subject of suicide requires the anti-gunners to get creative, however. **According to** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention **(CDC)** [**data**](http://www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/fatal_injury_reports.html)**, which cover years 1981 through 2013—incidentally, a period in which Americans acquired an additional 195 million firearms—the firearm suicide rate** (the number of suicides per 100,000 population) **decreased five percent, while the non-firearm suicide rate increased 27 percent.** Requiring that a person obtain a permit before acquiring a handgun is one of anti-gun activists’ favorite restrictions, particularly if the authorities that control the permits are allowed to arbitrarily refuse them to legally eligible applicants. The Brady Campaign [calls](http://www.nytimes.com/1993/08/15/weekinreview/a-little-gun-control-a-lot-of-guns.html) the concept “needs-based licensing,” with the understanding that if you aren’t in the FBI’s witness protection program, or a real life James Bond, or married to someone in the issuing officer’s immediate family, you couldn’t possibly need to have your application approved. So, Bloomberg’s researchers compared suicide trends before and after Connecticut increased its purchase permit requirement in 1995, and before and after Missouri eliminated its requirement in 2007. The researchers ran the numbers, for those states and the other 48, two ways. **When using a “synthetic” model – which is not the preferred approach when studying differences among the states – the researchers not surprisingly concluded that purchase permit laws reduce suicide.** Synthetic, in this case and as you might expect, means created from computer simulation. However, **when they ran the numbers according to traditional methodology based on actual data from the states, they admitted**, Connecticut’s permit law had **“no association with overall suicide rates**” and “[t]he repeal of Missouri’s [purchase permit] law was not associated with changes in any of the suicide measures.”

### A2 Fem

#### Disallowing women from using ‘masculine’ handguns ascribes gender norms

Charles 11 Chalres, Lindsay. "FEMINISTS AND FIREARMS: WHY ARE SO MANY WOMEN ANTI-CHOICE?" CARDOZO JOURNAL OF LAW & GENDER 17.197 (n.d.): n. pag. 2011. Web. 2 Dec. 2015. <http://www.cardozolawandgender.com/uploads/2/7/7/6/2776881/17-2\_charles\_ws.pdf>. [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

A more sinister explanation is that “gun control is, symbolically, male control.”11 Sociologist H. Taylor Buckner found that “[o]verall, the women who support gun control do so in the context of controlling male violence and sexuality.”12 Interestingly, “women who have been subjected to force (almost always by men) do not think that more gun laws will reduce violence against women.”13 Women who have been victimized by men are all too aware of the damage a man can inflict with just his bare hands, feet, or common household items. Women may also want to avoid being seen as having masculine traits such as gun ownership or proficiency because it is considered unladylike and unattractive.14 Moreover, some women might not be able to see themselves in the role of a protector or defender, and so delegate this responsibility to the man in their life or the police.15 These women may be willing to sacrifice some measure of security in order to stay within prescribed gender norms.

### A2 IPV

#### HG key to self defense and autonomy of women

Charles 11 Chalres, Lindsay. "FEMINISTS AND FIREARMS: WHY ARE SO MANY WOMEN ANTI-CHOICE?" CARDOZO JOURNAL OF LAW & GENDER 17.197 (n.d.): n. pag. 2011. Web. 2 Dec. 2015. <http://www.cardozolawandgender.com/uploads/2/7/7/6/2776881/17-2\_charles\_ws.pdf>. [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

Some women’s issues affect only a particular class of women: maternity leave and parental benefits affect only women who choose to become mothers, access to abortion affects only women of child-bearing age, and pay discrepancies affect only women in the work force. However, the fear of violence affects all women.27 Some women may respond to this fear with denial or a pacifist determination to succumb rather than fight back, and that is their choice. Others may decide, after careful consideration, that their bodies and lives are worth defending. These women must have a full range of self-defense tools in order for their choice to be meaningful. Pervasive acceptance of women’s armed self-defense could help change the current rape culture and encourage women to take responsibility for their own safety, while working for equality and an end to patriarchy. Guns are safe when used by responsible adults, and are the most effective tool for self-defense.28 Furthermore, removing restrictions on women’s choices increases individual freedom and can lead to greater personal autonomy.

#### Handguns protect freedom of women

Charles 11 Chalres, Lindsay. "FEMINISTS AND FIREARMS: WHY ARE SO MANY WOMEN ANTI-CHOICE?" CARDOZO JOURNAL OF LAW & GENDER 17.197 (n.d.): n. pag. 2011. Web. 2 Dec. 2015. <http://www.cardozolawandgender.com/uploads/2/7/7/6/2776881/17-2\_charles\_ws.pdf>. [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now] There was a time in this country when women had few choices about any facet of their lives—perhaps the biggest choice a woman would ever make involved which man to marry as she moved from her father’s house to her husband’s house. American women today have many important choices: whether to pursue higher education, where and what kind; with whom to share her life and whether she ought to marry; her vocation; where she will live; whether to become a mother; and even how to vote, thanks to the Nineteenth Amendment, ratified a mere ninety years ago. Choices are necessary for the freedom “to do, not do, become, or not become something.”65 Freedom to make choices, as well as freedom from external forces such as patriarchy and violence, are both necessary for autonomy: the ability of an individual to define her own conception of the good and exercise control over her own life.66 There are many factors that can reduce a woman’s choices in life, and therefore her freedom. Economic status, education level, others’ prejudice, even past choices, can all reduce available choices; this is unfortunate, but perhaps unavoidable. However, there is no reason for a government to reduce the selfdefense choices available to an individual, because “gun control laws do not reduce crime.”67 Women can be trusted to make good decisions for themselves, even—or perhaps especially—in difficult situations.

#### Granting self defense to women is key to helping them become equal in society

Charles 11 Chalres, Lindsay. "FEMINISTS AND FIREARMS: WHY ARE SO MANY WOMEN ANTI-CHOICE?" CARDOZO JOURNAL OF LAW & GENDER 17.197 (n.d.): n. pag. 2011. Web. 2 Dec. 2015. <http://www.cardozolawandgender.com/uploads/2/7/7/6/2776881/17-2\_charles\_ws.pdf>. [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now] Women have won many legal battles in the last forty years,76 but true liberty and equality remain elusive.77 None of the various strategies employed by feminist legal pioneers have won the war.78 Equal protection has not protected women from the discriminatory effects of laws dealing with pregnancy or abortion.79 The “undue burden” standard transforms the “right to abortion” into a “right to choose abortion, subject to restrictions designed to impede and disparage the choice.”80 The “right to privacy” implies that women should keep quiet about reproductive matters and take care of their shameful business behind closed doors.81 Substantive due process is a legal fiction, and its amorphous protections are subject to the opinions of five justices of the Supreme Court.82 The Privileges or Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment should provide textual support for protection of natural rights, but it has been virtually read out of the Constitution by the Supreme Court, beginning with the Slaughter-House Cases.83 The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment has been polluted by unprincipled use of substantive due process and should be abandoned for more fertile ground. Therefore, the almost identical text of the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause provides the most practical and productive support for a right to bodily integrity and individual autonomy. The Fifth Amendment provides that no person shall “be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. . . .”84 The “liberty” component of this clause is broad enough to protect an individual’s rights to make her own medical decisions about abortion and contraception, engage in consensual sexual behavior,85 and defend her bodily integrity by any means necessary. More importantly, unless one person’s liberty intrudes on another’s rights, no amount of “process” is sufficient to justify a significant deprivation of the right.86 This approach is markedly different from substantive due process because the substance comes from the guarantee of “liberty,” and any infringement, such as requiring a license for concealed carry, would require a showing of actual process—a procedural, not substantive protection. Legally and politically, the best strategy to accomplish this shift is to argue for a right to bodily integrity in the context of self-defense. There can be no legitimate governmental interest in depriving a woman of the right to resist rape or death, just as there can be no legitimate interest in interfering with an individual’s reproductive autonomy or private, consensual sexual conduct.87 The advantage of presenting a self-defense argument to gain recognition of the right to bodily integrity is that conservatives and liberals alike profess respect for the right of selfdefense. Liberals may hate guns, but only the most hard-hearted would condemn a woman for successfully using one in self-defense.88 Self-defense could be the ideal common ground to build a foundation for expanded women’s rights.

#### Handguns force police to pay attention

Charles 11 Chalres, Lindsay. "FEMINISTS AND FIREARMS: WHY ARE SO MANY WOMEN ANTI-CHOICE?" CARDOZO JOURNAL OF LAW & GENDER 17.197 (n.d.): n. pag. 2011. Web. 2 Dec. 2015. <http://www.cardozolawandgender.com/uploads/2/7/7/6/2776881/17-2\_charles\_ws.pdf>. [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now] Professor MacKinnon said it best: “[w]hat [women] need is change: for men to stop hurting them and using them because they are women, and for everyone to stop letting them do it because they are men.”34 Feminists have worked for

reforms aimed at recognizing women as people worthy of equality and respect, and this endeavor has been quite successful in some areas,35 but there is still much work to be done.36 Changing hearts and minds is the ultimate goal. However, until that dream becomes a reality, women’s armed self-defense may be both a strategy for achieving the goal, and a stopgap measure to prevent violence by men who refuse to see all women as fully human. Rape is tolerated, in part, because most of the time only women are hurt and no one dies. If women began defending themselves with firepower, the authorities might sit up and take notice. This strategy provided some benefits for Ku Klux Klan victims in the 1930s: [A]rmed self-defense brought police intervention which martyrdom would not have done. African-Americans, Catholics, Jews, immigrants, and radicals were neither popular nor powerful in the areas in which the KKK thrived. Public authorities and influential private citizens might well have been content to see unarmed victims brutalized or slain, if the violence could have been so confined. When victims arm themselves, however, authorities are compelled to act lest incidents lead to widespread bloodshed and disorder.37 The point is simple: while protecting the powerless may not be a high priority for public authorities, preserving order is. Police are likely to pay more attention to a man’s death than a woman’s rape; perhaps society would care more about the latter if it had the potential to impact the former.

#### While force isn’t desired, it is required until peace can be achieved

Charles 11 Chalres, Lindsay. "FEMINISTS AND FIREARMS: WHY ARE SO MANY WOMEN ANTI-CHOICE?" CARDOZO JOURNAL OF LAW & GENDER 17.197 (n.d.): n. pag. 2011. Web. 2 Dec. 2015. <http://www.cardozolawandgender.com/uploads/2/7/7/6/2776881/17-2\_charles\_ws.pdf>. [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now] Most men cannot comprehend the grievous harms of rape and domestic violence,40 but a widespread movement to prevent victimization “by any means necessary” might help them begin to understand the consequences—both for women who are abused, and for men who attempt to harm an armed woman.41 If women defended themselves violently, the amount of damage they were willing to do to would-be assailants would be the measure of their seriousness about the limits beyond which they would not be pushed. If more women killed husbands or boyfriends who abused them or their children, perhaps there would be less abuse. A large number of women refusing to be pushed any further would erode, however slowly, the myth of the masochistic female which threatens all our lives.42 It is reasonable to believe that violence against women would decrease once men begin to realize that attacking a seeminglydefenseless woman could be their destruction. The ideal, naturally, is a society of men and women who respect each other as equals and do not use the threat of violence to dominate and control any group. Until then, the best strategy may be to achieve “a social equilibrium of nonviolence” by arming women.43 Offensive violence may beget more violence, but unyielding self-defense begets détente.44 Peace would be preferable, but cessation of violence is essential.

## Circumvention

### 1NC Generic

#### No aff solvency - courts will strike down total bans, but regulations are upheld

Volokh 10 [Eugene Volokh (professor of law at the University of California, Los Angeles), "An End to Gun Bans," NY Times, 3/2/2010] AZ

Of the 50 states, 44 have state constitutional provisions that expressly secure a [right to keep and bear arms](http://www.trolp.org/main_pgs/issues/v11n1/Volokh.pdf) . At least 40 of them clearly protect an individual right, aimed partly at self-defense. But less stringent gun control laws may survive. Yet state courts interpreting those provisions have upheld the great majority of all modest gun controls that they have considered. They have struck down some total gun bans, and some other restrictions that dramatically affect people’s abilities to defend themselves. But less stringent restrictions have almost always been upheld. Likewise, federal courts applying D.C. v. Heller have upheld the great majority of the restrictions that they have considered, including all of the less stringent ones. Thus, for instance, courts have upheld bans on particular kinds of semi-automatic firearms (so-called “assault weapons”) precisely because the bans left people free to own many different kinds of other handguns, rifles, and shotguns that were just as effective for self-defense. The same seems likely to happen with federal review of state and local gun bans, if the U.S. Supreme Court concludes that the Second Amendment — like the First Amendment, the Fourth Amendment, and most of the rest of the Bill of Rights — applies to the states via the Fourteenth Amendment. Total handgun bans would be struck down. The same might happen to some of the most restrictive gun controls, such as laws banning gun possession by non-citizens (even ones who legally live in the U.S.). But less stringent gun controls, whether or not wise as a matter of policy, are almost certain to be upheld.

#### Plan doesn’t solve – the most deadly guns can be made at home legally for 10 times less and can be made completely untraceable

Kerr 14

[Dara Kerr - staff reporter for CNET covering the on-demand economy and tech culture: "'Ghost Gunner' lets people make untraceable, homemade guns" CNET 10/1/14; http://www.cnet.com/news/ghost-gunner-lets-people-make-untraceable-home-made-guns/]IG 12/10/15

What is a "ghost gun?" It's any type of firearm that is self-assembled and untraceable. It's one of gun control advocates and lawmakers biggest fears.

A few years ago, putting together such guns took insider knowledge and expertise. But with the growth of 3D printing, making gun parts has become easier. Now, with the release of a low-cost home milling machine, anonymously making firearm parts is even simpler.

Cody Wilson, the self-described anarchist who debuted the first 3D printed handgun in 2013, announced the launch of his newest project on Wednesday called Ghost Gunner.

Ghost Gunner is a computer-connected milling machine that aims to streamline the making of metal lower receivers for AR-15 semi-automatic rifles. While putting together AR-15 lower receivers at home is nothing new, Wilson's machine could speed up and modernize the process.

So, why the lower receiver? Under US firearms laws, it's the one piece of the gun that's legally considered a firearm and carries the gun's serial number. Therefore, an AR-15 with a handmade lower receiver is completely untraceable.

The AR-15 is thought of as one of the most deadly guns in the US. Several mass shootings over the past couple of years involved an AR-15, from Aurora to Newton to Santa Monica.

To name his milling machine, Wilson borrowed the term "ghost gun" from gun control advocates. In fact, a large part of his project is to thumb his nose at lawmakers trying to outlaw the making of untraceable guns at home.

California state Sen. Kevin de Leon has been working to pass a law that would require self-made guns to contain permanent pieces of metal and be registered with the Department of Justice through a serial number and gun owner background check.

"Technological advancements require that we update our laws to meet new and growing public safety concerns to make sure dangerous individuals cannot manipulate technologies at the expense of public safety," de Leon said in August as his bill headed to the governor's desk.

Wilson, and his organization Defense Distributed, took de Leon's bill proposal as a call to arms.

"It just seemed to be such an affront and also a challenge," Wilson told CNET. "We used his creation and his words to trademark the project...The ball is in his court."

California Gov. Jerry Brown vetoed de Leon's bill on Tuesday (PDF) saying, "I appreciated the author's concerns about gun violence, but I can't see how adding a serial number to a homemade gun would significantly advance public safety."

Defense Distributed built Ghost Gunner from the ground up using open-source hardware. The compact cube-shaped mill is constructed with a rigid steel frame and its drill bit can ready a lower receiver to be fit into other AR-15 components in an hour.

The Ghost Gunner costs around $1,500. Wilson said the machine can reliably drill one lower receiver per hour at the production output of a machine 10 times its cost.

When asked whether he's nervous about the authorities cracking down on him, Wilson said he's tried to cover his bases.

"It's going to be news to me with whatever they come up with," Wilson said. "We tried to satisfy every letter of every law."

#### An illegal market would immediately spring up due to low supply – means no solvency

Kates 82 – bracketed for language [Don B. Kates Jr (practices law with O'Brien and Hallisey in San Francisco), "Gun control versus gun prohibition," American Bar Association Journal, September 1982] AZ

Nor is there any reason to think that even a national prohibition could pre vent the development of a [illegal] ~~black~~ market sufficient to serve both criminals and ordinary citizens. If, for instance, handguns were smuggled into this\* country at the rate at which federal officials estimate marijuana is, more than 20 million guns of the size used to kill John Lennon could be imported illegally in any year. (There are only 60 million legally owned handguns at present.) Moreover, any competent machinist can build a revolver or automatic pistol from pot metal for a fraction of what even the cheapest commercially produced handgun costs. Can it be doubted that there would be thousands of "entrepreneurs" willing to build $15 junk .45s and .38s for a 500 per cent profit at [illegal] ~~black~~ market sale? Of course, this type of gun would not fire more than a few hundred rounds and would be accurate only at close range. But that is adequate for a buyer who wants a gun only for murder, robbery, or self-defense.

#### Federal agencies that would regulate gun control are severely understaffed – means no aff solvency

Harwood 02

[Harwood, William S - attorney in Portland, Maine, President of Maine Citizens Against Handgun Violence and a member of the American Bar Association Coordinating Committee on Gun Violence: "Gun Control: State Versus Federal Regulation of Firearms." Maine Policy Review 11.1 (2002) : 58 -73, [http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mpr/vol11/iss1/12.]IG](http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mpr/vol11/iss1/12.%5dIG) 12/2/15

Another potential factor in deciding whether the state or federal government should regulate firearms is which level of government is in the best position to effectively enforce those regulations. Although there is increasing cooperation between state and federal law enforcement, the general rule remains that federal law enforcement agencies enforce federal law, and state and local law enforcement agencies enforce state and local law. Therefore, the level of government that sets the regulations will normally be responsible for enforcing it. Clearly, strict enforcement of firearm regulations is important to successfully reducing gun violence. Indeed, in recent years the NRA has argued against more regulation of firearms by claiming that first the government needs to do a better job of enforcing the existing laws.

The federal agency with primary responsibility for firearm regulation is the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF). Despite having been in existence for many years, ATF’s powers are mostly limited to the licensing and taxation of firearm dealers. Because of its limited jurisdiction, ATF has a relatively small workforce; less than ten agents are assigned to the state of Maine. With this limited workforce, it is hard to imagine how ATF can effectively regulate the 1.3 million firearms in a state covering an area larger than the other five New England states combined. Although the federal government could expand the ATF workforce and investigatory powers, ATF does not currently have the resources to take on the primary responsibility for regulation of firearms.

### Enforcement Fails

#### Hard enforcement failure laundry list:

Jacobs 02 [James B. Jacobs, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice @ NYU Law, “Can Gun Control Work?” 2002. Can Gun Control Work?James B. Jacobs OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS] [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

Who would enforce handgun disarmament and with what degree of vigor? National Alcohol Prohibition was enforced by a small number of US. Treasury Department agents and by state and local police departments. Criminal justice and organized crime scholar Humbert S. Nelli writes that “Prohibition overburdened the criminal justice system and undermined respect for the nation’s law.” Another author recalled that “organization and methods . . . were hopelessly inadequate.”20 Professor McBain of Co- lumbia Law School wrote in 1928 that “the large-liquor drinking public has been indifferent to, if not positively in favor of, the corruption that helps to keep the stimulating stream flowing without interruption . . . the [police] force from the beginning has been thoroughly spoils-ridden.”21 In many cities, the police were contemptuous of alcohol prohibition and did not enforce it; corruption flourished. History has repeated itself with the contemporary drug war. After the Supreme Court’s decision in Printz, rejecting federal authority to order state and local officials to conduct background checks, National Handgun Prohibition might have to be a completely federal program.22 What kind of a federal enforcement agency would be needed to investigate and deter unlawful handgun possession? Currently, most illegal handguns are seized as a consequence of street or car stops made by local law en- forcement agents; a frisk reveals the gun.23 Routine car and street stops are not the province of federal agents, who lack general street-level policing authority and experience. Perhaps BATF could be expanded into a super nationwide street-level police agency with tens of thousands of new agents? Such a move would have to overcome the opposition of the NRA, gun owners, some members of Congress, and others who excoriate BATF agents as “jack-booted minions.”\* It would also have to overcome those who oppose expanding federal power and expending a great deal of fed- eral funds. Undoubtedly, there would be opposition and resistance from fringe elements, who for years have warned of a colossal and despotic federal government. The number of militia groups would probably grow, with the potential for Waco-type standoffs and shootouts.24

#### Passive enforcement failure:

Jacobs 02 [James B. Jacobs, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice @ NYU Law, “Can Gun Control Work?” 2002. Can Gun Control Work?James B. Jacobs OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS] [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

These potential problems suggest that passive enforcement might be a better alternative. BATF agents might make no special effort to identify and arrest handgun possessors. They could simply make arrests when handguns come to light in the course of investigations of other crimes. Of course, that is not much different than the way federal and state felon-in- possession laws are currently enforced. Some prosecutors, for political or practical reasons, would hesitate to prosecute unlawful possession cases, just as prosecutors today do not prosecute every drug possession case. They would face serious difficulties convicting defendants with no criminal record who claim to possess a gun for self-defense or sport. Currently, federal prosecutors decline to prose- cute a high percentage of charges even against persons with felony records when, though possessing firearms illegally, the arrested person has com- mitted no other crime.25 It would be much more difficult to convince fed- eral or state prosecutors to bring charges against otherwise law-abiding persons for merely violating National Handgun Prohibition. Even if pros- ecutors brought charges, it would be difficult to get unanimous guilty ver- dicts from jurors who, in many states, would be inclined to nullify the unpopular law. Perhaps enforcing unpopular, or at least controversial, handgun disar- mament could be made easier by setting the punishment low. If illegal possession of a handgun were treated as a misdemeanor or administrative violation, punishable by a small fine, say $250 or $500, jury trials could be avoided altogether. However, under that scheme, people who were committed to keeping their handguns would be no more deterred from Violating the gun law than from Violating the speed limit.

#### Federal agencies that would regulate gun control are severely understaffed – means no aff solvency

[Harwood, William S - attorney in Portland, Maine, President of Maine Citizens Against Handgun Violence and a member of the American Bar Association Coordinating Committee on Gun Violence: "Gun Control: State Versus Federal Regulation of Firearms." Maine Policy Review 11.1 (2002) : 58 -73, [http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mpr/vol11/iss1/12.]IG](http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mpr/vol11/iss1/12.%5dIG) 12/2/15

Another potential factor in deciding whether the state or federal government should regulate firearms is which level of government is in the best position to effectively enforce those regulations. Although there is increasing cooperation between state and federal law enforcement, the general rule remains that federal law enforcement agencies enforce federal law, and state and local law enforcement agencies enforce state and local law. Therefore, the level of government that sets the regulations will normally be responsible for enforcing it. Clearly, strict enforcement of firearm regulations is important to successfully reducing gun violence. Indeed, in recent years the NRA has argued against more regulation of firearms by claiming that first the government needs to do a better job of enforcing the existing laws. The federal agency with primary responsibility for firearm regulation is the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF). Despite having been in existence for many years, ATF’s powers are mostly limited to the licensing and taxation of firearm dealers. Because of its limited jurisdiction, ATF has a relatively small workforce; less than ten agents are assigned to the state of Maine. With this limited workforce, it is hard to imagine how ATF can effectively regulate the 1.3 million firearms in a state covering an area larger than the other five New England states combined. Although the federal government could expand the ATF workforce and investigatory powers, ATF does not currently have the resources to take on the primary responsibility for regulation of firearms.

#### Won't be enforced – empirics prove – even when it is enforced, minorities suffer the most

Tahmassebi 91 [Stefan B. Tahmassebi (lawyer in Fairfax, Virginia), "GUN CONTROL AND RACISM," George Mason University Civil Rights Law Journal Vol. 2 (1991): 67] AZ

Federal and state authorities in 1975 estimated that there were two million illegal handguns among the population of New York City. This number amounted to only 500,000 less handguns than the estimated number of legally owned handguns in California at that time and represented a significantly higher rate of handgun ownership than existed in the nation as a whole in 1975.[121] In a 1975 national poll, some ninety-two percent of the respondents estimated that fifty percent or more of handgun owners would defy a confiscation law.[122] Even registration laws as opposed to outright bans, measure a high percentage of noncompliance among the citizenry. In 1968, Illinois passed a firearm owner registration law. The Chicago Police estimated the rate of noncompliance at over two thirds. Statewide noncompliance was estimated at three fourths. In 1976, Cleveland city authorities estimated the rate of compliance with Cleveland's new handgun registration law at less than twelve percent.[123] Considering the fact that eighty-eight percent of handgun owners in Cleveland would not comply even with a registration law, the effectiveness of the "assault" gun ban ordinance enacted on February 17, 1989 must be seriously questioned. Regarding that law (which actually banned no assault guns, such as fully automatic firearms, but did ban virtually [Page 96] all semiautomatic firearms), Lt. Martin Flass of the Cleveland Police Department stated in August of 1990 that "to the best of our knowledge, no assault weapon was voluntarily turned over to the the Cleveland Police Department . . . considering the value that these weapons have, it certainly was doubtful individuals would willingly relinquish one."[124] In response to New Jersey's "assault weapon" ban, prohibiting the mere possession of many semiautomatic firearms, only eighty-eight of the 300,000 or more affected weapons in New Jersey had been registered as of November, 1990. No weapons had been surrendered to the police and only seven had been rendered inoperable.[125] As of November 28, 1990, only 5,150 guns of the estimated 300,000 semiautomatic firearms banned by the May 1989 California "Assault Gun" law had been registered as required with the California State Department of Justice.[126] These results suggest that the majority of otherwise law-abiding citizens will not obey a gun prohibition law; much less criminals, who will disregard such laws anyway. It is ludicrous to believe that those who will rob, rape and murder will turn in their firearms or any other weapons they may possess to the police or be deterred from using them again by the addition of yet another gun control law to the 20,000 plus that are already in effect in the United States.[127] Average citizens will generally keep their firearm in their home or business. Very few citizens habitually carry firearms. Clearly neither stop and frisk laws, streetside general searches, nor gun detection devices as advocated by the prohibitionists, would be able to enforce any gun prohibition. A serious attempt to enforce a gun prohibition would require an immense number of searches of residential and business premises. Thus, necessity would dictate that enforcement must involve intrusions into residences where firearms ownership is suspected. Furthermore, the bulk of these intrusions will be directed against racial minorities, whose possession of arms the enforcing authorities may view as far more dangerous than illegal arms possession by other groups. As civil liberties attorney Kates has observed, [Page 97] when laws are difficult to enforce, 'enforcement becomes progressively haphazard until the last of the laws are used only against those who are unpopular with the police.' Of course minorities, especially minorities who don't 'know their place', aren't likely to be popular with the police, and those very minorities, in the face of police indifference or perhaps even antagonism, may be the most inclined to look to guns for protection - guns that they can't acquire legally and that place them in jeopardy if possessed illegally. While the intent of such laws may not be racist, their effect most certainly is.[128] Given the potential discriminatory application of gun bans, and the grave consequences of such enforcement schemes, legislatures should not pass such statutes.

### 3D Printers

#### Plan doesn’t solve – the most deadly guns can be made at home legally for 10 times less and can be made completely untraceable

Kerr 14

[Dara Kerr - staff reporter for CNET covering the on-demand economy and tech culture: "'Ghost Gunner' lets people make untraceable, homemade guns" CNET 10/1/14; http://www.cnet.com/news/ghost-gunner-lets-people-make-untraceable-home-made-guns/]IG 12/10/15

What is a "ghost gun?" It's any type of firearm that is self-assembled and untraceable. It's one of gun control advocates and lawmakers biggest fears.

A few years ago, putting together such guns took insider knowledge and expertise. But with the growth of 3D printing, making gun parts has become easier. Now, with the release of a low-cost home milling machine, anonymously making firearm parts is even simpler.

Cody Wilson, the self-described anarchist who debuted the first 3D printed handgun in 2013, announced the launch of his newest project on Wednesday called Ghost Gunner.

Ghost Gunner is a computer-connected milling machine that aims to streamline the making of metal lower receivers for AR-15 semi-automatic rifles. While putting together AR-15 lower receivers at home is nothing new, Wilson's machine could speed up and modernize the process.

So, why the lower receiver? Under US firearms laws, it's the one piece of the gun that's legally considered a firearm and carries the gun's serial number. Therefore, an AR-15 with a handmade lower receiver is completely untraceable.

The AR-15 is thought of as one of the most deadly guns in the US. Several mass shootings over the past couple of years involved an AR-15, from Aurora to Newton to Santa Monica.

To name his milling machine, Wilson borrowed the term "ghost gun" from gun control advocates. In fact, a large part of his project is to thumb his nose at lawmakers trying to outlaw the making of untraceable guns at home.

California state Sen. Kevin de Leon has been working to pass a law that would require self-made guns to contain permanent pieces of metal and be registered with the Department of Justice through a serial number and gun owner background check.

"Technological advancements require that we update our laws to meet new and growing public safety concerns to make sure dangerous individuals cannot manipulate technologies at the expense of public safety," de Leon said in August as his bill headed to the governor's desk.

Wilson, and his organization Defense Distributed, took de Leon's bill proposal as a call to arms.

"It just seemed to be such an affront and also a challenge," Wilson told CNET. "We used his creation and his words to trademark the project...The ball is in his court."

California Gov. Jerry Brown vetoed de Leon's bill on Tuesday (PDF) saying, "I appreciated the author's concerns about gun violence, but I can't see how adding a serial number to a homemade gun would significantly advance public safety."

Defense Distributed built Ghost Gunner from the ground up using open-source hardware. The compact cube-shaped mill is constructed with a rigid steel frame and its drill bit can ready a lower receiver to be fit into other AR-15 components in an hour.

The Ghost Gunner costs around $1,500. Wilson said the machine can reliably drill one lower receiver per hour at the production output of a machine 10 times its cost.

When asked whether he's nervous about the authorities cracking down on him, Wilson said he's tried to cover his bases.

"It's going to be news to me with whatever they come up with," Wilson said. "We tried to satisfy every letter of every law."

#### Cheap and kills people

Telegraph 13 ["Australian police demonstrate 'catastrophic' dangers of 3D printed guns," The Telegraph, 5/28/2013] AZ

In a YouTube video highlighting the dangers 3D printable guns, Andrew Schipione, the commissioner for New South Wales Police, urges the public not to download the Computer Aided Design (CAD) files for the gun, known as [the Liberator.](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/10039822/First-3D-printed-gun-fired.html) He explained how his ballistics team had acquired a 3D printer, downloaded the blueprint for the weapons and assembled two pistols at a cost of just A$35 (£22). When fired, a bullet from one of the guns penetrated almost seven inches into a solid resin block resembling human flesh, deep enough to kill any human. The other weapon fell apart when it was fired. Mr Schipione said: “The catastrophic failure comes about because there are no standards around the manufacture of these weapons. They are truly undetectable. They are untraceable because they have no serial numbers, no unique identifiers. They are cheap and easy to make.”

#### 3D printers mean guns are always accessible

Kurman 13 [Melba Kurman (former Microsoft analyst, writer and technology analyst), "3D printing to provoke a new twist in American gun control," RT, 11/28/2013] AZ

Yes, you could. And I think this pulls us closer to the real danger, being amateur produced plastic weapons. In the US the black market has always existed, if you really want to buy a high-grade firearm, or a gun, it’s always been possible to get one. In fact, in many states, and this is regulated at the state level in the US, it’s actually not even difficult to get a weapon legally. So the fact that a 3D printer that prints high-grade metal parts can make a very nice metal 3D printed gun, that’s not so much the danger right now as these consumer guns. But looking forward, let’s say we go forward 10 years, given the drop in prices of the 3D printing technologies, it is simply going to be a matter of time and it’s going to happen, when these metal 3D printers that can print very high-grade metal parts will be affordable. Now this is a sort of machine only affordable to professional designers, engineering firms and companies, but when the price drops below 5-10,000 dollars, then people will be able to access those machines.

### Illegal Market

#### An illegal market would immediately spring up due to low supply – means no solvency

Kates 82 – bracketed for language [Don B. Kates Jr (practices law with O'Brien and Hallisey in San Francisco), "Gun control versus gun prohibition," American Bar Association Journal, September 1982] AZ

Nor is there any reason to think that even a national prohibition could pre vent the development of a [illegal] ~~black~~ market sufficient to serve both criminals and ordinary citizens. If, for instance, handguns were smuggled into this\* country at the rate at which federal officials estimate marijuana is, more than 20 million guns of the size used to kill John Lennon could be imported illegally in any year. (There are only 60 million legally owned handguns at present.) Moreover, any competent machinist can build a revolver or automatic pistol from pot metal for a fraction of what even the cheapest commercially produced handgun costs. Can it be doubted that there would be thousands of "entrepreneurs" willing to build $15 junk .45s and .38s for a 500 per cent profit at [illegal] ~~black~~ market sale? Of course, this type of gun would not fire more than a few hundred rounds and would be accurate only at close range. But that is adequate for a buyer who wants a gun only for murder, robbery, or self-defense.

#### Prohibition enforcement would be unsuccessful due to the black market.

Jacobs 02 [James B. Jacobs, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice @ NYU Law, “Can Gun Control Work?” 2002. Can Gun Control Work?James B. Jacobs OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS] [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

National Handgun Prohibition, whether actively or passively enforced, would have to contend with a black market.26 If the lawful supply of fire- arms was shut down, consider how easily guns could migrate into the black market. In the United States, there exists a black market in handguns that are stolen, purchased for unlawful sale, or otherwise diverted from lawful owners to criminals. According to Gary Kleck, “There appears to be stronger evidence pointing to theft as a major source of guns for crim- inals than illicit trafficking.” Perhaps half of the guns obtained by crimi- nals have been stolen at some time in the past, though not necessarily by the criminal who most recently possessed it and used it in a crime. Kleck estimates that as many as 750,000 guns are stolen each year.” Of the in- mates interviewed by sociologists James Wright and Peter Rossi in 1986, thirty-two percent said that they stole their most recently acquired hand- gun; 46% stated that their most recently acquired handgun was “definitely stolen,” while another 24% said the gun was “probably stolen.”28 Even in countries with strong prohibitory regimes (like Japan and Holland), crim- inals are able to obtain handguns relatively easily on the black market. We can reasonably estimate that there would be a stock of some 100 million or more handguns in private hands by the time National Handgun Prohibition was enacted (assuming booming sales in the 4-5 years leading up to prohibition). The handgun black market would be supplied by im- ports, stolen handguns, handguns illegally produced in clandestine work- shops, and handguns given away or sold by lawful owners, who oppose the law or who, for a profit, are willing to risk getting caught.

#### Empirical examples of prohibitions show that gun prohibition would lead to clandestine manufacturing.

Jacobs 02 [James B. Jacobs, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice @ NYU Law, “Can Gun Control Work?” 2002. Can Gun Control Work?James B. Jacobs OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS] [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

Closing down legitimate manufacturers would be a boon to black market producers. Clandestine handgun manufacturers would spring up, just as thousands of illegal stills operated during alcohol prohibition, and hun- dreds or thousands of clandestine labs now produce unlawful mood and mind-altering drugs like amphetamine and ecstasy. Even today, “zip guns” are produced or assembled in small workshops within the United States.\* These black market manufacturers, already illegal, operate outside any regulatory scheme for recordkeeping, serial numbers, safety locks, or tax- ation. Implementing a prohibition on importation of handguns would be even more difficult. Without (or with sharply diminished) domestic U.S. sources for new handguns, there would be a greater economic incentive for smugglers to bring in handguns from abroad. Is there any reason to believe that customs officials and other law enforcement personnel would be more successful in preventing handgun smuggling than in preventing drug smuggling? I think not. Contraband handguns, like illicit drugs, would enter the country illegally in seaborne containersa, trucks, cars, planes, and by mail. (Currently, there are firearms black markets in West- ern Europe, Where handguns smuggled from Eastern Europe and the for- mer Soviet Union are easily obtainable in Amsterdam, Brussels, and other cities.)16

#### Black markets render implementation of bans ineffective.

Levitt 04 [Steven D. Levitt is the Alvin H. Baum pf of Economics, University of Chicago, and Research Fellow, American Bar Foundation, “Understanding Why Crime Fell in the 1990s: Four Factors that Explain the Decline and Six that Do Not. Winter 2004. Journal of Economic Perspectives] [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

There are more than 200 million firearms in private hands in the United States?more than the number of adults (Cook and Ludwig, 1996). Almost two- thirds of homicides in the United States involve a firearm, a fraction far greater than other industrialized countries. Combining those two facts, one might conjec? ture that easy access to guns in the U.S. may be part of the explanation for our unusually high homicide rates. Indeed, the most careful study on the subject finds that higher rates of handgun ownership, which represent about one-third of all firearms, may be a causal factor in violent crime rates (Duggan, 2001). There is, however, little or no evidence that changes in gun control laws in the 1990s can account for falling crime. For example, the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1993 instituted stricter requirements for background checks before a gun is sold. However, Ludwig and Cook (2000) report no difference in homicide trends after the passage of the Brady Act in states affected by the law and states that already had policies in place that were at least as stringent as those in the Brady Act. Given the realities of an active black market in guns (Cook, Molliconi and Cole, 1995), the apparent ineffectiveness of gun control laws should not come as a great surprise to economists. Even in the late 1980s, prior to the Brady Act, only about one-fifth of prisoners reported obtaining their guns through licensed gun dealers (Wright and Rossi, 1994).

### A2 States Aff

#### Gun laws don't solve – weak enforcement and differing laws across states means that people can always access guns

Leeuw 13 [Michael de Leeuw (litigation partner at the New York firm of Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson, adjunct Professor at the Rutgers School of Law, member of the boards of the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and the City Bar Justice Center), "Let Us Talk Past Each Other for a While: A Brief Response to Professor Johnson," Connecticut Law Review, July 2013] AZ

Of course, we also examined the available empirical data, and—with (quite frankly) admirable candor—admitted that it is a close call as to whether the outright ban in Washington, D.C. was even partially effective, noting that “[s]tripped of context, the statistics cited above could be taken as evidence that restrictive firearms laws do not work,”19 and that “[w]e acknowledge, of course, that the empirical evidence concerning the effectiveness of gun control laws is not unequivocal.”20 And, even though we concluded that, on balance, the available studies “tilt in favor of the conclusion that the District’s handgun ban resulted in a decrease in gunrelated homicides and suicides,”21 we were hardly sanguine about the state of affairs in the District with regard to gun violence, noting that the outright ban was “far from a perfect solution.”22 Of course, the main reason for this—and the elephant in the room when it comes to gun violence—is the relative ease and anonymity with which people can purchase handguns in one state and then transport them elsewhere to sell on the street.23 The enormous difficulty in being able to track guns used in crimes to their origin creates a chasm in any rational study of the criminal use of firearms. I would assume it would be a law enforcement priority to determine whether someone in Kentucky (an extraordinarily lax state in terms of gun control measures)24 is buying a large quantity of handguns and then going over the border to sell them in Illinois, which has a relatively strict gun control regime.25

### A2 Buybacks

#### Gun buyback programs don’t work – gun control laws do not generally affect the guns that are used in crimes.

Levitt 04 [Steven D. Levitt is the Alvin H. Baum Professor of Economics, University of Chicago, and Research Fellow, American Bar Foundation, “Understanding Why Crime Fell in the 1990s: Four Factors that Explain the Decline and Six that Do Not. Winter 2004. Journal of Economic Perspectives] [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

Gun buy-back programs are another form of public policy instituted in the 1990s that is largely ineffective in reducing crime . First, the guns that are typically surrendered in gun buy-backs are those guns that are least likely to be used in criminal activities . The guns turned in will be, by definition, those for which the owners derive little value from the possession of the guns. In contrast, those who are using guns in crimes are unlikely to participate in such programs . Second, because replacement guns are relatively easily obtained, the decline in the number of guns on the street may be smaller than the number of guns that are turned in. Third, the likelihood that any particular gun will be used in a crime in a given year is low. In 1999, approximately 6,500 homicides were committed with handguns. There are approximately 65 million handguns in the United States . Thus, if a different handgun were used in each homicide, the likelihood that a particular handgun would be used to kill an individual in a particular year is one in 10,000. The typical gun buy-back program yields fewer than 1,000 guns. Thus, it is not surprising that research evaluations have consistently failed to document any link between gun buy-back programs and reductions in gun violence (Callahan, Rivera and Koepsell, 1994; Kennedy, Piehl and Braga, 1996; Rosenfeld, 1996; Reuter and Mouzos, 2003).

## Self Defense Frontlines

### A2 Police Solves

#### Need for speed

Kopel 9 [David Kopel (Adjunct Professor of Advanced Constitutional Law at Denver University Sturm College of Law, Research Director of the Independence Institute in Golden, Colorado, and Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C), "Pretend ―Gun-Free School Zones: A Deadly Legal Fiction," Connecticut Law Review, December 2009] AZ

Whenever there is a public debate on campus defense against mass murderers, there is almost certain to arise a vast amount of commentary from people who have no expertise with defensive tactics, yet who announce with certitude that campus police or security guards, or police arriving at the campus, will always provide sufficient protection. The view of actual experts is somewhat different. Police Marksman is a professional periodical for police officers that focuses almost entirely on police tactics involving firearms. It presents close analysis of incidents in which officers were attacked by armed assailants, and the tactics that did or did not work in response. Police Marksman also covers topics such as police sniper work in hostage situations, and other issues involving police use of firearms to protect the public. A 2007 issue of the magazine was devoted to the problem of the ―active shooter.‖ Before Columbine, the standard police tactic for dealing with an armed criminal inside a building was to establish a perimeter, and then gradually constrict the perimeter, safely clearing one room at a time.132 That was the tactic used at Columbine, with the result that eleven of the thirteen people who were murdered (including teacher Dave Sanders, who bled to death over the course of several hours) were killed while the police were methodically setting up the perimeter outside.133 Many more people might have been killed if the Columbine perpetrators had not committed suicide. Post-Columbine, police tactics began to change in regards to the ―active shooter‖—the term used by defense experts for Columbine-type attackers. Establishing and constricting the perimeter might be fine in a case where a bank robber is holding hostages inside a building. It is not the right response to the active shooter who is killing one person after another. In the article Rapid Deployment: Version 2.0, police trainer Dick Fairburn details the problem of effective police response to the active shooter. While the active shooter phase of Columbine lasted thirteen minutes, [m]any of the active shooter incidents we examined were over in three to four minutes, much quicker than four officers could be assembled as a rapid deployment team and hope to find and neutralize the shooter. This suggests that the only hope for stopping the shooter and saving lives in most active shooter events, will come from someone who is at the scene when the shooting starts.134 Simply put, by the time the S.W.A.T. team arrives, it will be too late. This means that neutralizing the active shooter will be up to a single School Response Officer (―SRO‖) already stationed at the high school, or the college campus police, or perhaps a nearby patrol officer who quickly arrives at the scene. The Police Marksman article states that sometimes, armed citizens may be the right, and only, response: Lacking an SRO or first arriving officer, the only hope for saving lives may fall to citizens who are on-scene when the attack begins. . . . [A]ctive shooters have been stopped by untrained citizens. In states where concealed carry is legal, the odds of a citizen being equipped to deal with an active shooter are enhanced. The Virginia Tech officials have been criticized for banning concealed weapons permits on their campus. Many universities still refuse to arm their campus police officers. The [Columbine killers‘] generation that wreaked havoc in high schools are now at universities—this is a dangerous time.135 Another article in the same issue observes that ―[t]he sooner someone—anyone—effectively intervenes through an act of courage, the fewer funerals will result. In past incidents, active shooters have been thwarted by police officers, security guards and school teachers.‖136 A police study describes some consistent patterns of active shooters. The report, released by the Force Science Research Center at Minnesota State University-Mankato, observes that the average post-Columbine ―rapid mass murder episode‖ lasts about eight minutes.137 The short time period makes it close to impossible for police to use the preferred tactic of deploying a four-man team, and makes it unlikely that even a two-officer team will be available in time.138 But ―[u]nlike conventional criminal predators, who often have no reluctance about attacking police,‖ active shooters are ―cowardly.‖ Report author Ron Borsch explains: They choose unarmed, defenseless innocents for a reason: They have no wish to encounter someone who can hurt them. They are personally risk- and pain-avoidant. The tracking history of these murderers has proved them to be unlikely to be aggressive with police. If pressed, they are more likely to kill themselves.139 Accordingly, the tactics that make sense in most situations, such as a gun battle with an armed robber or kidnapper trying to escape, are not appropriate for an active shooter. Instead, even a lone officer should ―close in and finish the fight with aggression . . . . The idea is to keep the adversary off-balance by always forcing him to react to your actions, rather than, after contact, reacting to him.‖140 The challenge of a single officer finding the killer in a large building may be complex. But once the killer is located, Borsch explains, officers should understand that ―this bad guy is one of the easiest man-with-gun encounters they will ever have.‖141 Indeed, ―[m]ost officers have already faced worse opponents from a personal safety standpoint . . . .‖142 Or as another article, analyzing the 2007 murders at an Amish schoolhouse in Pennsylvania, suggests, ―[a] running gun-battle at the early stages of an armed invasion is preferable to allowing a murderous predator unrestricted control of the environment.‖143 In short, by far the best response to an active shooter is for someone to start shooting back. If there is a policeman nearby who can start shooting back, wonderful. But if the killer has selected the targeted victims in a way so there is no police officer immediately at the scene, lives will be saved if one or more victims starts shooting back.

### A2 Inaccurate Shots

#### Missing shots isn't important – self-defense is from a close distance, missed shots won't hit bystanders, and deterrence is enough

Kopel 9 [David Kopel (Adjunct Professor of Advanced Constitutional Law at Denver University Sturm College of Law, Research Director of the Independence Institute in Golden, Colorado, and Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C), "Pretend ―Gun-Free School Zones: A Deadly Legal Fiction," Connecticut Law Review, December 2009] AZ

But what if someone misses a shot? Well, if we only think about that risk, then the proper response to an active shooter would be to make sure that no police officers ever go to the scene. After all, police officers only hit their targets eight percent of the time,144 or a third of the time,145 or less than twenty percent of the time.146 So the police officer who is shooting at the killer might miss and hit an innocent bystander. Of course, the idea of not calling the police is self-evidently absurd. The tangible risk that the policeman‘s shot might hit an innocent is far outweighed by the enormous danger of allowing the killer to act at will. Moreover, the missed shot rate is not really the point; the miss rate may be high, but the number of misses which hit an innocent bystander, let alone kill him, is much smaller. The data about police accuracy should also be considered in light of the fact that police who engage a target are trained to do so while staying fairly distant—twenty to thirty feet away. For personal self-defense situations, a defensive shot from a civilian is usually fired at distance of shorter than seven feet—a distance from which it is much easier to hit a stationary target. If the victims fire back several shots from a longer distance, it is likely that some would miss the killer, but extremely unlikely that any would kill an innocent person. Even if the latter risk were much greater, that risk is small compared to the risk of allowing the killer to take aimed shots again and again and again. Moreover, if one or more potential victims are firing at an attacker, even if the victims miss, being shot at is, to say the least, very distracting. An attacker who is under fire will have much less freedom to aim his own shots carefully and kill his intended victims. And as the Force Science Institute study explains, active shooters tend to crumble at the first sign of active resistance.147

### A2 Bad at Shooting

#### Self-defense is effective and people aren't bad shooters

Kopel 9 [David Kopel (Adjunct Professor of Advanced Constitutional Law at Denver University Sturm College of Law, Research Director of the Independence Institute in Golden, Colorado, and Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C), "Pretend ―Gun-Free School Zones: A Deadly Legal Fiction," Connecticut Law Review, December 2009] AZ

Writer Clayton Cramer is perhaps best known as the scholar who did the most to expose the hoax of Michael Bellesiles, a temporarily awardwinning author whose book Arming America claimed that guns were rare in America until shortly before the Civil War, but whose purported evidence (such as probate records) turned out to have been fabricated.203 Cramer also maintains a ―Civilian Gun Self-Defense Blog‖ which collects media reports of lawful self-defense by persons with firearms.204 The blog does not purport to provide the full picture of armed self-defense, only a fairly thorough collection of the instances which are reported in the media. The blog was created in 2003 and by 2009 had collected 4000 cases. At that point, Cramer tabulated some cumulative data. He found that of the 4000 cases there were six incidents in which a criminal took a gun from the defender. There was one incident of a defender mistakenly shooting at someone (police who were investigating a burglary at an auto dealership started shooting at an employee, and he returned fire). And, while most self-defense incidents occurred in a place where carry permits are not needed (e.g., one‘s home, one‘s own business, or, in some states, one‘s automobile), there were 212 self-defense cases with licensed carry permit holders.205 We know from experience that the millions of Americans who carry licensed handguns almost everywhere in their states are not a nation of klutzes. Accordingly, one must ask whether the millions of Americans who do not act incompetently when the need for armed self-defense arises will somehow turn into dangerous buffoons if the attack takes place on a college campus. To emphasize again, the question involves only persons who are already licensed by the state to carry almost everywhere within the state.

#### Even if people are bad shooters, there's still a net positive in lives saved

Kopel 9 [David Kopel (Adjunct Professor of Advanced Constitutional Law at Denver University Sturm College of Law, Research Director of the Independence Institute in Golden, Colorado, and Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C), "Pretend ―Gun-Free School Zones: A Deadly Legal Fiction," Connecticut Law Review, December 2009] AZ

An active shooter situation at a school is more complicated. Compared to an ordinary violent crime, there are likely to be many more people in the area. Depending on the particular circumstance, the armed defender might be just a few feet away from the attacker (a distance that is typical for ordinary self-defense situations), or the defender might be on the other side of a large room. But even in the latter situation, the balance of risks favors active selfdefense. Imagine a scenario in which all of the killer‘s victims are either lying on the ground (following the Brady Center‘s advice to ―play dead‖)207 or are running in panic. Nobody is trying to stop the killer; all the victims are following the university rules of ―Don‘t be a hero‖ and ―Never attempt to disarm‖ a violent attacker. For the people on the ground, the killer can inflict a head shot at close range that will very likely be fatal. Hitting a moving target is more difficult. Of course the killer‘s chance of inflicting a fatal or crippling wound on the moving target are much better if he is concentrating on accurate shooting. Now consider a second scenario. This time, someone is shooting back at the killer. It is been said that ―when a man knows he is to be hanged in a fortnight, it concentrates his mind wonderfully.‖208 So does being shot at. It is much more difficult to shoot accurately if someone is shooting at you. If the net result is that attacker and the defender both end up firing a lot of inaccurate shots, the result is likely to be a large net savings of lives. The killer will never have the time for an accurate head shot on a close-range victim, and his chances against the mobile victims will diminish greatly. Maybe a stray shot from the killer will hit someone, but that shot is less likely to be an accurate one which would inflict a fatal or crippling injury. There would be a risk that a third party could be injured by a stray shot from the defender. But the defender would have not been aiming at the third party and trying to kill him, so there is some chance that the stray shot would not inflict a critical injury. Massively degrading the lethal accuracy of a shooter who is intent on mass homicide is likely to save many more lives than might be lost because one or two of the intended victims were fighting back.

### A2 Shoot Wrong Person

#### No they won't – and it's non-unique anyway
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Some campus police chiefs worry that police officers coming on the scene will not know if the shooter is a legitimate defender, or is the attacker. Identifying the ―kid without a plan‖ would take up police time while they took him into custody. Or he might be mistakenly shot by police.209 These objections, however, do not just apply to campus defense. They are applicable in any case where police come upon a crime scene in which the victim is resisting successfully. Already in most of the United States, concealed permit holders can carry almost everywhere in public. The risk of police confusion or mistake is no greater on a campus than it is anywhere else in a state. After decades of experience with licensed carry around the nation, opponents of licensed carry cannot point to frequent instances of the police harmfully mistaking an armed victim with a carry license for a perpetrator. Indeed, quite apart from citizens having guns for self-defense, police often face situations where they have to make a quick decision about who is the attacker and who is the victim. Encountering a brawl in a bar, a domestic violence incident, or a robbery in which the victim is fighting back, the police may not know immediately who is the perpetrator and who is the victim. The police are specifically trained to deal with such situations, and this training helps them avoid shooting the victims by mistake. Moreover, in a ―Shall Issue‖ state, the legislature has already decided that in almost all public places, the benefits of armed resistance by victims far outweigh the potential risk of a police mistake. If a would-be mass murderer starts trying to kill people at a shopping mall, or a public park, then the ―Shall Issue‖ law makes it entirely possible that by the time the police arrive, one or more victims will have already started shooting back. But the most important fact is that the police are fairly unlikely to encounter the active shooter. In the large majority of active shooter incidents at schools, when the perpetrator hears that the police are close by, he kills himself.210 Not every single active shooter incident ends this way, but the number of cases in which the imminent arrival of the police leads to suicide by the active shooter far outnumber the cases in which the active shooter fights it out with the police.211 So, by the time the police get there, the shooting will probably be over. This will either be because the killer heard the police coming and killed himself, or it will be because somewhat earlier, a victim was able to fight back and the killer was stopped sooner. In case the police burst in on a gun battle in progress, the killer‘s prompt suicide may well end any confusion.

### A2 CCW = Crime

#### CCW licensers are nice and not criminals
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Florida permit revocations in 1987–97.245 Most of these listings provide no indication that the person whose permit was revoked had committed any crime with a gun, let alone an ―atrocious act of gun violence.‖246 To the contrary, only thirteen listed offenses include use of a firearm as an element, such as ―adjudication withheld on felony assault with a deadly weapon,‖ ―adjudication withheld on felony aggravated assault with a firearm,‖ or ―convicted of felony possession with intent to distribute cocaine, possession of a firearm during drug trafficking offense.‖ Indeed, for the vast majority of the offenses—such as assault or drug sales—the absence of a firearms count would seem to indicate that a firearm was not used. Likewise, there is no indication that a firearm was used in the many offenses of simple possession of marijuana, passing fraudulent checks, or other non-violent crimes. In short, the Brady Center‘s self-cited data, even if extrapolated nationally, do not come remotely close to supporting its allegation that ―thousands of people with CCW licenses have committed atrocious acts of gun violence.‖247 In the Brady Center policy paper opposing campus carry, Appendix A asserts that a CCW permit ―in no way guarantees public safety. In fact, it can often be a license to kill.‖248 Of course there are no policies that ―guarantee‖ public safety; the question is whether the policy improves public safety. As for the ―license to kill,‖ the Brady Center provides a litany of twenty-nine cases from around the country, 249 presumably the most atrocious ones it could find. Now, if every one of these involved a criminal homicide, these twentynine cases (out of a national CCW licensee population of about five million) would mean that CCW licensees have a criminal homicide rate far below that of the general population. But most of the twenty-nine most atrocious CCW stories that the Brady Center could find do not even involve conduct with a gun that was carried pursuant to a CCW permit. 250 Of those that do, not all of them are exactly the stuff of ―a license to kill.‖ For example, United States Representative John Hostettler forgot to take his handgun out of his bag when going through airport security; he pleaded guilty to a misdemeanor.251 A former judge made the same mistake and also pleaded guilty to a misdemeanor charge.252 In Virginia, a school teacher left a handgun locked in a car while the car was parked on school property; he was charged with violating the Virginia law against firearms on school property.253 And in Pennsylvania, the transportation director for a school district was suspended for several months for, among other charges, what the district described as ―unintentionally bringing a loaded firearm onto school property‖ when he left a handgun in a motorcycle saddlebag.254 The Brady Center lists some cases in which a person was arrested after a shooting, but almost never reports dispositions. The Brady Center thus treats a case that was not prosecuted, because an investigation established that the defendant acted in lawful self-defense, as equivalent to a case of criminal homicide. For example, the Brady Center writes: ―Fort Lauderdale, Florida, January 1, 2006. Rogelio Monero [sic], 49, allegedly shot and killed Victor Manuel Villanueva, 17, during a New Year‘s altercation as Moreno tried to stop a fight between Villanueva and a third party. Moreno was charged with manslaughter.‖ 255 Yet an Austin Examiner phone call to the Fort Lauderdale Police Department revealed that the shooting had been determined to be a justifiable homicide.256 Another Brady Center story: Vancouver, WA, October 3, 2006. Jon W. Loveless, unemployed for ten years, daily marijuana smoker, and father of two children—said that he shot ―until my gun was empty‖ at Kenneth Eichorn [sic, Eichhorn], because Eichorn [sic] had ―a weird look‖ on his face. Loveless also claimed that Eichorn [sic] held a handgun, but the Eichorn [sic] family disputes the claim. Loveless was charged with one count of second-degree murder. Missing from the Brady account is the conclusion to the story, which was reported October 5, 2006, in the same newspaper that the Brady Center had cited: Jon W. Loveless was exonerated Thursday on charges of second-degree murder and was to be released from the Clark County Jail. . . . On Wednesday, [Senior Deputy Prosecutor] Fairgrieve indicated he had yet to see evidence that would support a second-degree murder charge. He said the standards police use to arrest a suspect are lower than what prosecutors use to file charges, and by law charges against a person in custody must be filed within 72 hours of the suspect‘s first court appearance.257 The Brady Center monograph reports four cases of gun accidents, two of them fatal. As for criminal homicides by people who actually had CCW permits (not people whose permits had earlier been revoked, although the Brady Center lists these), there is only one that was committed in a public place (where the permit would even be relevant), and one more that was committed at home. There are three other cases of misusing a gun against another person (making an improper threat, or carrying it while impersonating a police officer, and a robbery perpetrated by a police officer‘s wife).258 Are CCW permittees perfect? No, but they are much more lawabiding than the general population, as the government data indicate. Indeed, ―[e]ven off-duty police officers in Florida were convicted of violent crimes at a higher rate than permit-holders.‖259 So, should off-duty police be allowed to carry concealed firearms when on school property? If the answer is ―No, because they might commit a violent crime against a teacher or student,‖ then one could, with logical consistency, also oppose campus carry by CCW licensees (although the fear of licensees would have a weaker empirical basis than the fear of off-duty police). On the other hand, if one thinks that the potential anti-crime benefit of allowing off-duty police to carry on campuses outweighs the (miniscule) risk that an off-duty officer might commit a crime, then one would have even less reason to be afraid of a CCW licensee.